REMARKS

Claims 1-53 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Official Action dated September 5, 2002, claims 1-53 were rejected. Applicant herein amends claims 1, 16-19, 29, 38, 45, and 49. Applicant now requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-53.

Applicant thanks Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Response to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 paragraph 2

The Examiner rejected claims 31, 34-36, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis for the "second presentation element".

With respect to claim 31 and claim 43, Applicant respectfully submits that the "second presentation element" is properly introduced in claim 31 at line 8, as printed in the included clean copy of the claims. Likewise, claim 43 properly introduces the second presentation element. Claims 34-36 depend directly or indirectly from claim 31 and thus rely upon the introduction in claim 31 for their antecedent basis. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be removed. If Applicant has misinterpreted Examiner's rejection for insufficient antecedent basis, Applicant respectfully requests clarification of the nature of the rejection.

The Examiner rejected claim 45 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis for "the optical mouse". Claim 45 has been amended to replace "optical mouse" with "pointing device", which was properly introduced in claim 40 from which claim 45 indirectly depends. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 45 is now in condition for allowance and request favorable action from the Examiner.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his suggestion regarding claim 29, and has amended claim 29 to comply with the suggestion. Applicant now respectfully requests the objection to claim 29 be removed.

Response to rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner cites Daniels (U.S. Patent No. 6,417,840) as the primary reference for all §102e and §103 rejections in the pending case. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 16-17, 20-21, 26-28, 38-48, and 49-53 using Daniels as a §102(e) reference. The remaining claims were rejected using Daniels as the primary §103 reference alone or in combination. All pending claims have been separated below based on their independent claims.

With respect to independent claims 1, 38, and 49 and their dependent claims 2-15, 20-30, 39-48, and 50-53, Applicant respectfully submits that Daniels does not disclose each element and feature of the listed claims. Representative claim 1 as amended recites in part "an electronic control device... and a coherent light source ...wherein the electronic control device and the coherent light source may be operated simultaneously with each other...." Independent claims 1, 38 and 49 each recite similar limitations that require the coherent light source and the control device (or application control means in claim 38) to be able to be operated simultaneously with each other. Hence, there may be, for example, four operational states for the two functional devices, including: 1.) both off; 2.) control device on alone; 3.) coherent light source on alone; and 4.) both on. This advantageously allows the user to perform multiple functions at once, allowing for greater flexibility and efficiency in the use of the device.

Daniels does not disclose a combination coherent light source and electronic control device in which both the light source and the control device may operate simultaneously. To the contrary, Daniels discloses an apparatus that allows only the laser or the mouse to be functional

at any given time. (See Col 4 lines 3-7 and 12-15.) Since Daniels does not disclose an apparatus which allows the coherent light source and electronic control device to be operated simultaneously, it fails to anticipate the claimed invention of claims 1-15, 20-30, 38-48, and 49-53. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 38 and 49, along with all of the dependent claims are therefore patentable over Daniels alone or in combination.

With respect to claims 16-19, Examiner rejected the claims as being anticipated by Daniels. However, as amended, claim 16 recites in part: "a first presentation module...; and a second presentation module..., wherein the first presentation module and the second presentation module are configured to couple together to form a unitary article." Claim 16 and its dependent claims 17-19 advantageously recite a modular presentation device in which a first module and a second module may be coupled together to form a complete device. This allows for the creation of customizable devices by allowing various modules to be combined together into a unitary device and later swapped out for a different module should the need arise.

Daniels, on the other hand, merely discloses a cordless IR mouse with an integrated laser pointer. While Daniels does disclose an apparatus combining the functions of a mouse and a laser pointer, it does so in a static and fixed fashion. Daniels does not disclose modularity, or the ability to connect two modules together to form a unitary device. There is no suggestion in Daniels that the modules may be separated and possibly rearranged or re-paired. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-19 are patentable over Daniels alone or in combination for at least the reasons set out above.

With respect to claims 31-37, Applicant respectfully submits that they are not anticipated by Daniels. Independent claim 31 recites in part: "a radio-frequency communication unit... an optical pointing device controller...a second presentation element...configured to provide a

second control signal... a switch mechanism... and a coherent light source..." Independent claim 31 advantageously includes a second presentation element in addition to the optical pointing device controller and the coherent light source, effectively requiring three presentation elements. This allows even more functionality from the device. As noted, the second presentation element may be configured to provide a second control signal to the host system. This allows the device to provide another method of input into the host system and may increase the usability and efficiency of the device.

As discussed above, Daniels merely discloses a mouse with an integrated laser pointer. Thus, there are only two presentation elements. The third presentation element is not disclosed nor contemplated in Daniels. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 31-37 are patentable over Daniels alone or in combination.

Response to rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Examiner rejected dependent claims 11-15 and 18-19 under the combination of Daniels and Stork et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,329). As discussed above, Daniels does not fully anticipate any of the claims present in the application as amended. Additionally, several of the dependent claims include further features and limitations that Stork does not adequately disclose.

Representative claim 11 depends from independent claim 1, and similarly dependent claim 18 depends from claim 16, and further recites a feature of "a writing mechanism..." The claim advantageously includes a writing utensil as part of the claimed invention. This allows a user to perform writing functions while also serving as a presentation device.

By contrast, Stork discloses a system for tracking handwriting as a form of computer input and control. Stork focuses solely on an apparatus and method for capturing the handwriting movements of the user to provide input to the computer system. It does not

contemplate a control device that includes an electronic control device, a coherent light source, and a writing mechanism. As discussed above, Daniels is cited to provide all elements except the writing mechanism and the gyroscopes. However, as discussed above, Daniels does not disclose all the remaining elements of claim 1, which are incorporated into claims 11-15 and 18-19.

Nor is there any motivation to combine Stork with Daniels. Daniels discloses a cordless mouse and laser pointer while Stork discloses a handwriting tracking system. Neither contemplates a combination of their technology with other input devices, let alone with each other. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons set out above claims 11-15 and 18-19 are patentable over the combination of Stork and Daniels.

Examiner rejected claims 29 and 30 in light of Daniels combined with Shimada (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,132). In addition to the deficiencies discussed above with Daniels, Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments.

Claim 29, as amended, depends from claim 1 and further recites "a power management unit configured to turn off at least one of the electronic control device and the coherent light source in response to a predetermined condition." Claims 29 and 30 advantageously recite a power savings scheme that allows the device to turn off either the control device or the coherent light source when they are not needed. By removing power from the device, i.e., turning the device off, the power consumption of the device may be lessened and thus, the lifespan of the power supply may be lengthened.

Shimada discloses an information entry device, which utilizes a CPU to control the general operation of the device. Shimada further discloses a power saving scheme in which the clock cycles of the CPU are reduce thereby causing the CPU to consume less power since it is performing less operations. While this does operate as a power savings scheme, the similarity

between Shimada and the claimed invention end there. As noted above, Shimada merely reduces the clock rate of the CPU, it does not turn anything off. Furthermore, there is no discussion in Shimada of turning off the control device, or turning off a coherent light source. There is no discussion even in general terms of shutting off individual components, and at best discusses the general proposition of slowing down the processing speed of a CPU.

Moreover, there is no motivation to combine Shimada with Daniels. Daniels deals with a cordless mouse combined with a laser pointer while Shimada deals with a pen-based information entry device. There is no suggestion in either reference to combine with the other. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons set out above, claims 29 and 30 are patentable over the combination of Daniels and Shimada.

Examiner rejected claims 22-25 and 31-37 under the combination of Hu and Daniels. Examiner noted that Hu discloses an optical mouse while Daniels discloses the remaining elements of the claims. As discussed above, Daniels fails to disclose each of the remaining elements. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Hu does not disclose an optical mouse, but merely discloses a mouse-wheel position sensor that utilizes an optical sensor to detect mechanical movement of the wheel. There is no discussion or teaching in Hu of using optical sensors to generate mouse cursor data as is generally required in an optical mouse. Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 22-25 and 31-37 are patentable for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-53, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, including references cited, but not applied. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

In addition, Applicant respectfully invites Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
Gerhard A. Schneider

Date: 12-5-02 By: James E Glore

James E. Glore, Reg. No. P-51,744
FENWICK & WEST LLP
Two Palo Alto Square
Palo Alto, CA 94306
Telephone: (650) 858-7614
Facsimile: (650) 494-1417

Attachment: Claim Revisions

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

1. (Amended) A universal presentation device comprising:

an electronic control device communicatively coupled with a computer system to provide a control mechanism for the computer system; and

a coherent light source configured to provide a coherent light beam for pointing the coherent light beam on an object,

wherein the electronic control device and the coherent light source may be operated simultaneously with each other, and are dimensioned to form a substantially unitary device when at least one of the electronic control device or the coherent light source is operational.

16. (Amended) A modular universal presentation device comprising:

a first presentation [element]module configured to provide a first presentation function, the first presentation function including the use of an electrical circuit; and

a second presentation [element]module configured to provide a second presentation function,

wherein the first presentation [element]module and the second presentation [element]module are configured to couple together to form a unitary article.

17. (Amended) The modular universal presentation device in claim 16, wherein the first presentation [element]module includes one from the group comprising a laser pointer element and a pointing device element.

18. (Amended) The modular universal presentation device in claim 16, wherein the second presentation [element]module includes one from the group comprising a writing instrument element.

19. (Amended) The modular universal presentation device in claim 16, wherein the first presentation [element]module and the second presentation [element]module couple with a releasable locking assembly.

29. (Amended) The universal presentation device of claim 1, further comprising a power management unit configured to turn off at [lest]least one of [the turn off]the electronic control device and the coherent light source in response to a predetermined condition.

38. (Amended) A universal presentation device comprising:

a communication means for communicating with a host system;

an application control means for controlling the host system;

a coherent light source means for generating a coherent light beam to light at least a portion of an object; and

a housing means for housing the communication means, the control mechanism means and coherent light means;

wherein the coherent light source means and application control means may be operated simultaneously.

45. (Amended) The universal presentation device of claim 44, wherein the application control means further comprises an input means for receiving a user input into the second

presentation element when the second mode is selected and into the [optical mouse]pointing device when the first mode is selected.

49. (Amended) In a universal presentation device, a method comprising the steps of:

communicating with a computer system;

receiving a user input via an electronic control device;

controlling the computer system in response to the user input;

providing a coherent light source for generating a coherent light beam to reflect off an object; and

housing the electronic control device and the coherent light source in a unitary device;

wherein the steps of controlling the computer system and providing a coherent light source may be performed simultaneously.